

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,375	05/09/2001	Igor Shvets	1817-0111P	3911
2292	7590 04/20/2004		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			SINES, BRIAN J	
	PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1743	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W

			\mathcal{L}			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/851,375	SHVETS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Brian J. Sines	1743				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versilize to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a re within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communic ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ja	<u>ınuary 2004</u> .					
,	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>18-54</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
11) I he oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	taminer. Note the attached	Office Action of form PTO-15.	∠.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 		119(a)-(d) or (f).				
2. Certified copies of the priority document						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		received in this National Stage	€			
application from the International Bureau		raccivad				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not	icociveu.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	5) 🔲 Notice of Ir	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	_ ·				

Art Unit: 1743

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding claims 1 and 13, the term "flow restrictor" does not appear to be specifically discussed in the specification. Since the term "flow restrictor" is not specifically discussed or defined, it is unclear as to what structural limitation is imparted to the claimed apparatus by the recitation of this term in the claims.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claims 1 and 13, it is unclear as to what structural limitation imparts the functional ability of the liquid outlet means in the body of the claimed apparatus to have a resistance to flow to the liquid outlet means which is substantially greater than through the hollow interior of the body. Does the flow restrictor comprise a specific coating or structural configuration? The applicant is advised that the Courts have held that apparatus claims must be

Art Unit: 1743

structurally distinguishable from the prior art in terms of structure, not function. See *In re Danley*, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959); and *Hewlett-Packard Co. V. Bausch and Lomb, Inc.*, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (see MPEP § 2114). The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18 - 54 are allowed.

The cited prior art neither teach or fairly suggest the further incorporation within the apparatus of Van Lintel the pressure compressible means as recited in claim 18. The cited prior art neither teach or fairly suggest the further incorporation of a pressure compressible means comprising a gas bubble. The cited prior art neither teach or fairly suggest the further incorporation of expandable tubing, which forms the pressure compressible means. The cited prior art neither teach or fairly suggest the further incorporation of a means for sensing the flow conditions within the outlet means; and a means for causing the apparatus to operate in response to the sensed flow conditions. The cited prior art neither teach or fairly suggest the further incorporation of a liquid take-off means included in the outlet in the body of the apparatus, which enables the flow rates of the liquid in the apparatus and the liquid outlet means to be substantially equal. The cited prior art neither teach or fairly suggest the further incorporation pipe included in the liquid outlet of the body of the apparatus, which is connected between the liquid outlet and the body. The cited prior art neither teach or fairly suggest the incorporation of a positive

Art Unit: 1743

displacement pump with a liquid outlet link assembly comprising a pressure compressible means.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 1/20/2004, with respect to claims 1, 7 and 9 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1, 7 and 9 in view of van Lintel has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Sines, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1263. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (11:30 AM - 8 PM EST).

Art Unit: 1743

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700